



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/031,018	04/24/2002	Dorit Arad	10365/07406	4459		
75	90 06/18/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
Eugenia S Hansen Sidley Austin Brown & Wood 717 N Hardwood Suite 3400			ZEMAN,	ZEMAN, MARY K		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				TATER NOMBER		
Dallas, TX 75201-6507			1631			
		DATE MAILED: 06/18/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	e Action Summary		Part of Paper No./Mail	Date 0604
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date U.S. Patent and Trademark Office		Interview Summary (I Paper No(s)/Mail Dat Notice of Informal Pa Other:	e	52)
1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been re priority documents reau (PCT Rule 17	ceived in Application have been received 7.2(a)).	d in this National St	age
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:		,	(a) or (t).	
		25 11 0 0 6 440(-)	(d) == (6)	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the column 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•	• , ,		• ,
9) The specification is objected to by the Exan 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to	accepted or b)	•		
Application Papers				
7) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> are subject to restriction and	or election require	ement.		
5)☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.				
4) Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the applicated 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with		leration.		
Disposition of Claims	t			
closed in accordance with the practice und	er Ex parte Quayl	∍, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	•	· •		nerits is
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ ⁻	This action is non-	final.		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _	·			
Status				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatior - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by s' Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the n earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DN. R 1.136(a). In no event, h a reply within the statutory riod will apply and will ex latute, cause the applicati	owever, may a reply be time minimum of thirty (30) days bire SIX (6) MONTHS from to to become ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timely. he mailing date of this com (35 U.S.C. § 133).	munication.
Period for Reply	appears on the co	ver sneet with the ct	лтеѕропиенсе авы	633
The MAILING DATE of this communication	Mary K Zema		1631	
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit	
	10/031,018		ARAD ET AL	
,	Application I	lo.	Applicant(s)	

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/031,018

Art Unit: 1631

Election/Restriction

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application.

Lack of Unity

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

With respect to unity of invention PCT Rule 13.1 states:

The international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity of invention").

Additionally, PCT Rule 13.2 states:

Unity of invention exists only when there is a technical relationship among the claimed inventions involving one or more special technical features. The term "special technical features" is defined as meaning those technical features that define a contribution which each of the inventions considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

With regard to the application of PCT Rule 13, 37 CFR §1.475 concerning unity of invention states:

- (a) An international and a national stage application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity of invention"). Where a group of inventions is claimed in an application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.
 - (b) An international or a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations of categories:
 - (1) A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product; or
 - (2) A product and a process of use of said product; or
 - (3) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and a use of the said product; or
 - (4) A process and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process; or
 - (5) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process.
 - (c) If an application contains claims to more or less than one of the combinations of categories of invention set forth in paragraph (b) of this section, unity of invention might not be present.
 - (d) If multiple products, processes of manufacture or uses are claimed, the first invention of the category first mentioned in the claims of the application and the first recited invention of each of the other categories related thereto will be considered as the main invention in the claims, see PCT Article 17(3)(a) and 1.476(c).
 - (e) The determination whether a group of inventions is so linked as to form a single general inventive concept shall be made without regard to whether the inventions are claimed in separate claims or as alternatives within a single claim.

Art Unit: 1631

Group I, claim(s) 1-6 and 24 drawn to a process for the design of anti-tumor compositions.

Group II, claim(s) 7-11, drawn to a method for the design of a paclitaxel alternative composition.

Group III, claim(s) 12 and 17-23-in-part, drawn to a first chemical composition-SPECIES ELECTION REQUIRED.

Group IV, claim(s) 13 and 17-23-in-part, drawn to a second chemical composition-SPECIES ELECTION REQUIRED

Group V, claim(s) 14 and 17-23-in-part drawn to a third chemical composition- SPECIES ELECTION REQUIRED.

Group VI, claim(s) 15 and 17-23-in-part, drawn to a fourth chemical composition-SPECIES ELECTION REQUIRED.

Group VII, claim(s) 16 and 17-23-in-part, drawn to a fifth chemical composition-SPECIES ELECTION REQUIRED.

The inventions listed as Groups I-VII do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The chemical compositions of Groups III-VII are not a novel contribution over the art. WANG et al. (1999) Organic Letters, Vol. 1 No. 1 p 43-46, cited in the international search report, discloses paclitaxel alternative compositions and derivatives that meet the requirements of the claims. (See page 44). As such the chemicals themselves are not a novel contribution over the art, and are not a special technical feature linking all the groups. The methods of Groups I and II are methods of design, and are not limited to any particular structure, such that no particular chemical links all the groups. The two methods do not share a special technical feature, as they are differing methods having differing steps and goals. Therefore, neither the chemicals of Groups II-VII nor the methods of Groups I-II set forth a special technical feature linking all the claims as defined in PCT Rule 13.2.

Art Unit: 1631

Group I, claims 1-6 and 24 share the inventive concept of being drawn to the method of designing anti-tumor compositions using 3-dimensional modeling, based on a known anti-tumor composition.

Group II, claims 7-11, share the inventive concept of being drawn to the method of designing a paclitaxel alternative composition using particular atomic measurements and comparisons.

Group III, claims 12 and 17-23-in-part, share the inventive concept of being drawn to the first chemical composition having variables of R1-R6 and X.

Group IV, claim 13 and 17-23-in-part, share the inventive concept of being drawn to the second chemical composition having variables of R1-R6 and X.

Group V, claim 14 and 17-23-in-part, share the inventive concept of being drawn to the third chemical composition having variables of R1-R6 and X.

Group VI, claim 15 and 17-23-in-part, share the inventive concept of being drawn to the fourth chemical composition having variables of R1-R6 and X.

Group VII, claim 16, and 17-23-in-part, share the inventive concept of being drawn to the fifth chemical composition having variables of R1-R6 and X.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention of Groups III-VII: Each chemical compound falling within each group is a differing species. Each chemical is a different chemical entity, having a differing structure. Applicant is required to elect ONE constituent for EACH variable in the recited structure. For example, if Group III is elected, a constituent for each of R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6 and X must be specifically elected and recited.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Each of the chemicals listed in claims 12-16 are separate and distinct, as the structures are not a novel contribution over the art, as identified above. WANG (1999) discloses compositions meeting the limitations of the claims.

Art Unit: 1631

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 12-16 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(h).

A fully responsive reply will comprise the Group elected, a particular species elected if applicable, and all claims reading upon the elected group and/or species.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary K Zeman whose telephone number is (571) 272 0723.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P Woodward can be reached on (571) 272 0722. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1631

()

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on the contents of the electronic file wrapper, or on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MARY K. ZEMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER